

APPLICANT(S): PERETS, Yona et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/673,267
FILED: September 30, 2003
Page 8

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1 - 36 are pending in the application. Claims 1-36 have been rejected. Claims 1 - 6, 10, 11, 14 - 16 and 22 - 31 have been amended.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 2, 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 29 and 31 because of alleged informalities. Claim 2, 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 29 and 31 have been amended in order to cure these informalities. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the objections.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 5 has been amended to read "said controller is to activate at least two of said sub-detectors substantially simultaneously". Applicants respectfully assert that this amendment render claim 5 proper under 35 U.S.C. §112 and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

APPLICANT(S): PERETS, Yona et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/673,267
FILED: September 30, 2003
Page 9

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection base on Fulghum

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 10, 14-17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c), as being anticipated by Fulghum et al. (US 6,580,930). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the amendments made and the remarks that follow.

Amended independent claims 1, 14 and 28 recite

“a controller to choose a mode of operation for the selection of the detection algorithm”.

Similarly, amended independent claims 22 and 25 recite

“choosing a mode of operation for the selection of a signal-detection algorithm from at least a power mode of operation and a performance mode of operation”

Fulghum describes a receiver having a “less complex detector” and a “more complex detector” (see Fig. 2). Only if the less complex detector is not sufficient, a more complex detector is used to detect the signal (see abstract)

It is respectfully submitted that Fulghum et al does not teach or fairly suggest at least “a controller to choose a mode of operation for the selection of the detection algorithm”, as recited by claims 1, 14 and 28 and “choosing a mode of operation for the selection of a signal-detection algorithm from at least a power mode of operation and a performance mode of operation”, as recited by claims 22 and 25.

In order for a reference to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), the reference must teach every element of the claim. Applicants assert that Fulhalm does not teach every element of Applicants' independent claims 1, 14, 22, 25 and 28 as amended. Applicants therefore assert that independent claims 1, 14, 22, 25 and 28 as amended are allowable over Fulhalm.

Each of claims 2-7, 10, 15-17, 20, 24, 27, and 29-32 depends, directly or indirectly, from one of independent claims 1, 14, 22, 25 and 28 and incorporates all the elements of the parent claim as well as additional distinguishing features. Therefore, claims 2-7, 10, 15-17, 20, 24, 27, and 29-32 are allowable.

APPLICANT(S): PERETS, Yona et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/673,267
FILED: September 30, 2003
Page 10

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections of claims 1-7, 10, 14-17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27-32.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection base on Yang

The Examiner also rejected claims 11, 23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Yang (US 6,763,074 B1).

As discussed above, independent claim 1 was amended to include "a controller to choose a mode of operation for the selection of the detection algorithm" and independent claims 22 and 25 were amended to include "for the selection of a signal-detection algorithm from at least a power mode of operation and a performance mode of operation". It is respectfully submitted that Yang does not teach or fairly suggest at least the above recited features of claims 1, 22 and 25. Applicants therefore assert that independent claims 1, 22 and as amended are allowable over Yang.

Claims 11, 23 and 26 are dependent from 1, 22 and 25, respectively, and incorporate all the elements of the parent claims. It is respectfully submitted that claims 11, 23 and 26 are patentable, and thus allowable, at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 22 and 25. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections of claims 11, 23 and 26.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8, 18 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Fulghum et al. (US 6,580,930 B1) in view of Acker (US 4,335,361).

Claims 12 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Fulghum et al. (US 6,580,930 B1) in view of Wong-Lam et al. (US 5,487,085).

Claims 13 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Fulghum et al. (US 6,580,930 B1) in view of Zak et al. (US 6,084,926).

Claims 9, 19, 21 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Fulghum et al. (US 6,580,930 B1) in view of Yang (US 6,763,074).

APPLICANT(S): PERETS, Yona et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/673,267
FILED: September 30, 2003
Page 11

The allowability of claims 1, 14, 22, 25 and 28 over Fulghum and Yang was discussed above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections and the discussion is applicable here. None of Acker, Wong-Lam and Zak can cure the deficiencies of either of Fulghum and Yang, alone or in combination. Each of claims 8 - 9, 12 - 13, 19 - 21 and 33 - 36 depends, directly or indirectly, from one of independent claims 1, 14, 22, 25 and 28, and includes all the features of the claim from which it depends as well as additional distinguishing features. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 8 - 9, 12 - 13, 19 - 21 and 33 - 36 are likewise allowable.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 1, 14, 22, 25 and 28 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,



Marc Tritel
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 59,336

Dated: March 26, 2007

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, New York 10036
Tel: (646) 878-0800
Fax: (646) 878-0801